



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/625,527

07/24/2003

Yoshinori Yoshida

Q76642

8152

23373 7590 04/06/2011
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

DESAI, ANISH P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1788

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/06/2011

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

sughrue@sughrue.com
PPROCESSING@SUGHRUE.COM
USPTO@SUGHRUE.COM

Art Unit: 1788

1. **Continuation of Box 3:**

2. The after-final (AF) amendment submitted on 03/23/2011 is not entered into consideration because, newly amended claim limitation "wherein the urethane polymer and acrylic polymer are bonded together to produce a copolymer possessing a covalent bonding" along with requires further consideration under 35 USC section 112-first paragraph for new matter. Further, the after-final amendment is not entered into consideration because, newly amended claim 1 which now requires that the pressure-sensitive adhesive layer is "in contact" with the composite film changes the scope of the claimed invention, which requires further search and consideration.

3. **Continuation of Box 11:**

4. As to applicant's arguments against the 35 USC Section 112-first paragraph rejection as set forth in the Final Office action (FOA) mailed on 12/23/2010, the Examiner submits that the present amendment continues to raise issue of new matter with respect to claim language "wherein the urethane polymer and acrylic polymer are bonded together to produce a copolymer possessing a covalent bonding". Specifically, it is again noted that while there is a support to recite specific urethane polymer and specific acrylic polymer that can be bonded together (i.e. urethane-acrylic block copolymer-see page 21 lines 10-15 of the specification) and for specific type of bonding

Art Unit: 1788

(i.e. covalent bonding), there is no support to broadly claim any urethane polymer and any acrylic polymer are bonded together in covalent bonding.

5. While applicant has pointed to reaction between isocyanate and hydroxyl group, and isocyanate and carboxyl group (see page 6 of the AF amendment) and argued against the 112-first paragraph rejection, the Examiner respectfully submits that said chemical reactions only show e.g. formation of urethane (i.e. reaction between NCO group and OH group), but does not support the claim language of "wherein the urethane polymer and an acrylic polymer are bonded together to produce a copolymer possessing a covalent bonding..."

6. Applicant can overcome this rejection if applicant were to recite "a composite film comprising a composition containing urethane-acrylic block copolymer, wherein the urethane polymer and an acrylic polymer are bonded together to produce a copolymer possessing a covalent bonding". This will clarify that the urethane polymer and acrylic polymer are urethane-acrylic block copolymer (see page 21 lines 10-15 of the specification) and such block copolymers would intrinsically have covalent bonding as evidenced by applicant's submission (submission date 07/18/2007) of excerpt from *Encyclopedia of Polymer Science and Engineering, Vol 8*. John Wiley & Sons, New York (1984), pages 279-280.

7. As to applicant's arguments against the 102(b) rejections based on Ochi et al. (US 5,225,267), the Examiner submits that the arguments are not persuasive given that the arguments are based on amendment (see paragraph 2 above) that requires further search and consideration.

Art Unit: 1788

8. **Continuation of Box 13:**

9. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 03/23/2011 after the final rejection was mailed on 12/23/2010 is considered, because there was a clerical error in submission of the IDS that was previously submitted on 05/10/2010 and the reference (JP 2000-230115) that is cited on the IDS of 03/23/2010 was submitted in timely fashion on 05/10/2010 (see page 5 of the AF amendment).

/A. D./

Examiner, Art Unit 1788

/Alicia Chevalier/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1788